

Message

From: Cooke, Maryt [Cooke.Maryt@epa.gov]
Sent: 3/23/2021 5:02:45 PM
To: Sanchez, Yolanda [Sanchez.Yolanda@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: draft Hunters Point briefing paper

Yes, ma'am

From: Sanchez, Yolanda <Sanchez.Yolanda@epa.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, March 23, 2021 12:42 PM
To: Cooke, Maryt <Cooke.Maryt@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: draft Hunters Point briefing paper

Mary,
Will you be able to attend the 3 pm call today?

Y

From: Sanchez, Yolanda
Sent: Monday, March 22, 2021 3:50 PM
To: Libelo, Laurence <Libelo.Laurence@epa.gov>; Walker, Stuart <Walker.Stuart@epa.gov>; Cooke, Maryt <Cooke.Maryt@epa.gov>
Cc: Fitz-James, Schatzi <Fitz-James.Schatzi@epa.gov>; Simes, Benjamin <Simes.Benjamin@epa.gov>; Azad, Ava <Azad.Ava@epa.gov>; Fairbanks, Brianna <fairbanks.brianna@epa.gov>; Chesnutt, John <Chesnutt.John@epa.gov>; Praskins, Wayne <Praskins.Wayne@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: draft Hunters Point briefing paper

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

However, some of the responses have raised concerns, and John suggested we should further discuss. At John's suggestion, **I am scheduling a meeting Tuesday at 3:00 pm (ET)/12:00 pm (PT) to further discuss the** headquarters perspective on the way we are framing the conversation with the Navy.

Enrique is reviewing the latest talking points and Q&As (attached), and I anticipate he will share it with Dana and Greg soon. We brief Enrique on Thursday (3/25). We are supposed to meet with the Navy, DTSC, and CDPH on Monday (3/29) where the meeting will be the principals from each agency +1.

Yolanda Sanchez | U.S. EPA, Region 9 | Community Involvement for Superfund | Desk: 415-972-3880

From: Libelo, Laurence <Libelo.Laurence@epa.gov>
Sent: Thursday, March 18, 2021 8:21 AM
To: Walker, Stuart <Walker.Stuart@epa.gov>; Cooke, Maryt <Cooke.Maryt@epa.gov>; Praskins, Wayne

<Praskins.Wayne@epa.gov>

Cc: Fitz-James, Schatzi <Fitz-James.Schatzi@epa.gov>; Simes, Benjamin <Simes.Benjamin@epa.gov>; Azad, Ava <Azad.Ava@epa.gov>; Fairbanks, Brianna <Fairbanks.Brianna@epa.gov>; Sanchez, Yolanda <Sanchez.Yolanda@epa.gov>; Chesnutt, John <Chesnutt.John@epa.gov>

Subject: RE: draft Hunters Point briefing paper

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

Laurence

Laurence Libelo, Chief
Science Policy Branch
ARD/OSRTI/OLEM
(703) 603-8815
Cell (571) 447- 3986

From: Walker, Stuart <Walker.Stuart@epa.gov>

Sent: Thursday, March 18, 2021 11:03 AM

To: Cooke, Maryt <Cooke.Maryt@epa.gov>; Praskins, Wayne <Praskins.Wayne@epa.gov>

Cc: Libelo, Laurence <Libelo.Laurence@epa.gov>; Fitz-James, Schatzi <Fitz-James.Schatzi@epa.gov>; Simes, Benjamin <Simes.Benjamin@epa.gov>; Azad, Ava <Azad.Ava@epa.gov>; Fairbanks, Brianna <Fairbanks.Brianna@epa.gov>; Sanchez, Yolanda <Sanchez.Yolanda@epa.gov>; Chesnutt, John <Chesnutt.John@epa.gov>

Subject: RE: draft Hunters Point briefing paper

I should have also mentioned this other new Biden EO which mentions peer review

<https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/presidential-actions/2021/01/27/memorandum-on-restoring-trust-in-government-through-scientific-integrity-and-evidence-based-policymaking/>

Government Through Scientific Integrity and Evidence-Based Policymaking

JANUARY 27, 2021 • PRESIDENTIAL ACTIONS

MEMORANDUM FOR THE HEADS OF EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

It is the policy of my Administration to make evidence-based decisions guided by the best available science and data. Scientific and technological information, data, and evidence are central to the development and iterative improvement of sound policies, and to the delivery of equitable programs, across every area of government. Scientific findings should never be distorted or influenced by political considerations. When scientific or technological information is considered in policy decisions, it should be subjected to well-established scientific processes, including peer review where feasible and appropriate, with appropriate protections for privacy. Improper political

Stuart Walker
Superfund Remedial program National Radiation Expert
Science Policy Branch
Assessment and Remediation Division
Office of Superfund Remediation and Technology Innovation
W (703) 603-8748
C (202) 262-9986

From: Walker, Stuart

Sent: Wednesday, March 17, 2021 10:53 PM

To: Cooke, Maryt <Cooke.Maryt@epa.gov>; Praskins, Wayne <Praskins.Wayne@epa.gov>

Cc: Libelo, Laurence <Libelo.Laurence@epa.gov>; Fitz-James, Schatzi <Fitz-James.Schatzi@epa.gov>; Simes, Benjamin <Simes.Benjamin@epa.gov>; Azad, Ava <Azad.Ava@epa.gov>; Fairbanks, Brianna <fairbanks.brianna@epa.gov>; Sanchez, Yolanda <Sanchez.Yolanda@epa.gov>; Chesnutt, John <Chesnutt.John@epa.gov>

Subject: RE: draft Hunters Point briefing paper

This attached 2017 response letter from Jim Woolford, OSRTI OD, at the time provides some information on science supporting EPA's PRG/DCC calculators, including external peer and other reviews which are listed out on pages 6-9 of the attachment to the letter.

Stuart Walker
Superfund Remedial program National Radiation Expert
Science Policy Branch
Assessment and Remediation Division
Office of Superfund Remediation and Technology Innovation
W (703) 603-8748

From: Walker, Stuart

Sent: Wednesday, March 17, 2021 10:31 PM

To: Cooke, Maryt <Cooke.Maryt@epa.gov>; Praskins, Wayne <Praskins.Wayne@epa.gov>

Cc: Libelo, Laurence <Libelo.Laurence@epa.gov>; Fitz-James, Schatzi <Fitz-James.Schatzi@epa.gov>; Simes, Benjamin <Simes.Benjamin@epa.gov>; Azad, Ava <Azad.Ava@epa.gov>; Fairbanks, Brianna <fairbanks.brianna@epa.gov>;

Sanchez, Yolanda <Sanchez.Yolanda@epa.gov>; Chesnutt, John <Chesnutt.John@epa.gov>

Subject: RE: draft Hunters Point briefing paper

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

I will send another email that details the peer, verification, comparison, and corroboration reviews of the PRG/DCC and RESRAD models, which also includes screenshots from EPA's model on guidance evaluation.

With the new Biden EO on Environmental Justice, I would be surprised to see a backing away from peer review, see at this link and screenshot of selected text below: <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/presidential-actions/2021/01/20/executive-order-protecting-public-health-and-environment-and-restoring-science-to-tackle-climate-crisis/>

Section 1. Policy. Our Nation has an abiding commitment to empower our workers and communities; promote and protect our public health and the environment; and conserve our national treasures and monuments, places that secure our national memory. Where the Federal Government has failed to meet that commitment in the past, it must advance environmental justice. In carrying out this charge, the Federal Government must be guided by the best science and be protected by processes that ensure the integrity of Federal decision-making. It is, therefore, the policy of my Administration to listen to the science; to improve public health and protect our environment; to ensure access to clean air and water; to limit exposure to dangerous chemicals and pesticides; to hold polluters accountable, including those who

The final guidelines issued by the Obama administration in 2002 put an emphasis on scientific information that undergoes an independent peer review process, see screenshot from page 4 below and this link <https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/sites/default/files/omb/fedreg/reproducible2.pdf>

The Presumption Favoring Peer-Reviewed Information. As a general matter, in the scientific and research context, we regard technical information that has been subjected to formal, independent, external peer review as presumptively objective. As the guidelines state in paragraph V.3.b.i: "If data and analytic results have been subjected to formal, independent, external peer review, the information may generally be presumed to be of acceptable objectivity." An example of a

Stuart Walker
Superfund Remedial program National Radiation Expert
Science Policy Branch
Assessment and Remediation Division
Office of Superfund Remediation and Technology Innovation
W (703) 603-8748
C (202) 262-9986

From: Cooke, Maryt <Cooke.Maryt@epa.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, March 17, 2021 5:19 PM
To: Praskins, Wayne <Praskins.Wayne@epa.gov>; Walker, Stuart <Walker.Stuart@epa.gov>
Cc: Libelo, Laurence <Libelo.Laurence@epa.gov>; Fitz-James, Schatzi <Fitz-James.Schatzi@epa.gov>; Simes, Benjamin <Simes.Benjamin@epa.gov>; Azad, Ava <Azad.Ava@epa.gov>; Fairbanks, Brianna <Fairbanks.Brianna@epa.gov>; Sanchez, Yolanda <Sanchez.Yolanda@epa.gov>; Chesnutt, John <Chesnutt.John@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: draft Hunters Point briefing paper

Hi Wayne –

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

From: Praskins, Wayne <Praskins.Wayne@epa.gov>
Sent: Monday, March 15, 2021 7:59 PM
To: Walker, Stuart <Walker.Stuart@epa.gov>; Cooke, Maryt <Cooke.Maryt@epa.gov>
Cc: Libelo, Laurence <Libelo.Laurence@epa.gov>; Fitz-James, Schatzi <Fitz-James.Schatzi@epa.gov>; Simes, Benjamin <Simes.Benjamin@epa.gov>; Azad, Ava <Azad.Ava@epa.gov>; Fairbanks, Brianna <Fairbanks.Brianna@epa.gov>; Sanchez, Yolanda <Sanchez.Yolanda@epa.gov>; Chesnutt, John <Chesnutt.John@epa.gov>
Subject: draft Hunters Point briefing paper

Stuart and Mary –

Please see the attached draft briefing paper on the (currently informal) Hunters Point dispute between EPA and the Navy. We would appreciate your quick staff-level review, by noon Wednesday if possible. We plan to brief Enrique on Thursday, and expect him to send out a revised draft to Dana and Greg late this week or (more likely) next week. Thanks.

Wayne Praskins | Superfund Project Manager
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 9
75 Hawthorne St. (SFD-7-3)
San Francisco, CA 94105
415-972-3181